

REMARKS

By the present amendment, claim 1 has been amended to replace “polarizing element” by “display” on line 1 so that claim 1 is now identical to previously presented claim 37. Accordingly, claim 37 has been canceled and claims 3-6, 8-11, 19-23, 26-27, and 31-32 have been amended to replace “polarizing element” by “display” on line 1. Further, claim 13 has also been amended to replace “polarizing element” by “display” on line 1 and “polarizing element comprises” by “display comprises a polarizing element comprising” on line 2.

Also, claims 35 and 36 have been amended to replace “the optical element” by “the polarizing element” as recited in claim 12 on which claims 35 and 36 depend, and claim 36 has been amended to replace “the backlight” by “a backlight.”

It is submitted that these amendments do not raise any new issues. In particular, it is submitted that the recitation in claim 1 was previously presented in claim 37, and that the corresponding modifications to the dependent claims and claim 13 are immediate. Accordingly, entry and consideration of the amendments is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-14, 16-27, and 29-36 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 12, and 13 are the only independent claims.

In the Office Action, claims 35 and 36 are objected to as lacking antecedent basis for “the optical element” and “the backlight.”

Claims 35 and 36 have been amended to replace “the optical element” by “the polarizing element” as recited in claim 12 on which claims 35 and 36 depend, and claim 36 has been amended to replace “the backlight” by “a backlight.” Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Next, in the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 11-14, 16, 19-22, 24-25, 27, and 30 are

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over US 6,381,068 to Harada et al. ("Harada"), and claims 9 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Harada in view of US 5,880,800 to Mikura et al. ("Mikura").

Claims 1 and 13 have been amended to be directed to a display as in claim 37, and a method of manufacturing a display, respectively. It is noted that claim 37 is not included in this rejection. Accordingly, it is submitted that Harada fails to teach or suggest the subject matter of present claims 1 and 13, as well as the claims dependent directly or indirectly thereon. In addition, with respect to claim 12, it is submitted that Harada is completely silent as to a liquid crystal display as recited in present claim 12. Further, Mikura fails to remedy the deficiencies of Harada.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Next, in the Office Action, claims 1-8, 10-16, 18-27, 29, and 31-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over US 5,999,243 to Kameyama et al. ("Kameyama") in view of Harada.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Contrary to the interpretation in the Office Action (see Office Action at page 7, lines 1-3), Harada does not suggest using a diffusing adhesive in any optical construction. In particular, contrary to the interpretation in the Office Action, it may often be advantageous to reduce weight and thickness by combining optical layers, but a person of the art in the field of optical constructions would be wary of modifying an order of optical elements, or adding any optical element, in a particular optical construction, without a clear expectation of an advantageous effect in terms of optical properties. In other words, optical properties are paramount for an optical construction, and a person of the art would not carry out modifications when the risk of significant deterioration of optical properties is expected or possible, especially when the prospect of optical improvements is unknown or

unascertained.

Thus, a person of the art would immediately understand that the disclosure in Harada concerns a diffusing layer in a projection screen, and not a liquid crystal display as in Kameyama. The purely reflective projection screen of Harada is very different from the display of Kameyama, which is a backlit liquid crystal display. Therefore, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found no guidance on whether, or how, a diffusing layer as in Harada might be of use in a display as in Kameyama. As a result, that person would have had no motivation to modify Kameyama by referring to Harada.

More specifically, both Kameyama and Harada are completely silent as to any problems or insufficiencies of, or requirements for, a diffusing plate, let alone any suggestion as to improvements thereto, and Kameyama and Harada are also completely silent as to improvements to viewing angle and coloring uniformity by a modified diffusing plate or polarizing element. Thus, the person of the art, being aware that it is difficult to determine the source of given optical problems of this type, and that, once such problem has been identified, it is also difficult to attribute an expectation of improvement to any specific optical element, would have found no guidance in Kameyama and Harada as to whether and how viewing angle or coloring by a modified diffusing plate or polarizing element, as opposed to other measures. Therefore, even if, *arguendo*, a person of ordinary skill in the art had developed a motivation to attempt to improve on the construction of the display of Kameyama, that effort would not have led to focus on a diffusing plate or a polarizing element, would not have led to refer to Harada, and would not have led to incorporate and modify a diffusing element of Harada into the display of Kameyama, because the person of ordinary skill in the art would not have derived any guidance or expectation of success from Harada regarding whether and how to modify, eliminate, replace, or incorporate a diffusing

element of Harada in a display as in Kameyama.

In addition, even if, arguendo, a person of the art had attempted to refer to Harada, that person would not have found any guidance as to the location of a diffusing layer in the display of Kameyama. In its reflective projection screen, Harada is concerned only about the direction of the light reflected by the reflective polarizer, for which the relative position of the diffuser is not critical, since the diffuser will modify the direction of the reflected light essentially in the same manner, whether the diffuser is in front of the quarterwave plate or behind the quarterwave plate. In addition, even if the diffuser modifies the light properties, this is of little concern in Harada because after leaving the screen, the light is simply transmitted to the viewer without further modifications. In contrast, in a display as in Kameyama, light exiting the optical element comprising a reflective polarizer is expected to be transmitted through several optical layers, often including polarizing layers and/or a liquid crystal cell, for example. Therefore, optical transformations occurring in the optical element are more likely to be amplified in the light finally transmitted to the viewer. As a result, Harada completely fails to provide a motivation to move a conventional diffuser from the front of the liquid crystal display, as in Kameyama, to a position more toward the rear, such as behind a retardation plate, let alone a positioning and modification of the diffusing element itself in combination with a reflective polarizer and a retardation film.

In contrast, the present inventors have unexpectedly discovered that, in the presently claimed invention, an advantage of the light-diffusion pressure-sensitive adhesive layer located as recited in present claims 1, 12, and 13 in a display is that it is possible to obtain excellent polarization performances and display quality, for example, when stress generated in the polarizing element can be relieved by the flexible pressure-sensitive adhesive layer, so that an unpredictable phase contrast can be avoided. Accordingly, coloring can unexpectedly be

suppressed over a wide viewing angle range, including a frontal viewing angle and various slant viewing angles, as described in the present specification. In addition, it is possible to reduce optical losses caused by interfacial reflection, so that a display device with a higher brightness can be obtained. Such effect is particularly advantageous in a display such as a liquid crystal display in which polarization is used repeatedly by means of a reflection layer and/or a polarization member to use transmitted light.

In particular, the experimental results in Table 1 on page 10 of the present specification show that the location of the diffusing adhesive layer as recited in present claims 1, 12, and 13 in a display is critical to preventing color variation in the display.

Kameyama is completely silent as to these features of the presently claimed invention, and Harada fails to remedy these deficiencies of Kameyama. Therefore, the present claims are not obvious over the cited references taken alone or in any combination.

With respect to the other dependent claims, the cited references are also completely silent as to the combinations of features recited in these respective claims. Therefore, these respective claims are not obvious over the cited references taken alone or in any combination.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

In the event there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to our Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Nicolas E. Seckel
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,373

Atty. Docket No. 020587

Customer No.: 38834

1250 Connecticut Avenue NW Suite 700

Washington, D.C. 20036

Tel: (202) 822-1100

Fax: (202) 822-1111

NES:rep